

1

2

3

4

5

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

9 || JAMES GOODALL,

Petitioner,

11 | VS.

12 || VALORIE J. VEGA, et al.,

13 || Respondents.

Case No. 3:10-CV-00733-LRH-(RAM)

ORDER

Petitioner has submitted a notice of appeal. Petitioner is attempting to appeal to this court the Nevada Supreme Court's denial of his petition for a writ of mandamus. That petition, in turn, arose from the administrative closure of a civil action filed in the Eighth Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada.

This Court does not have appellate jurisdiction to consider petitioner’s claims. “[A]ppellate jurisdiction to reverse or modify a state-court judgment is lodged, initially by § 25 of the Judiciary Act of 1789, 1 Stat. 85, and now by 28 U.S.C. § 1257, exclusively in [the Supreme Court of the United States]. Federal district courts . . . are empowered to exercise original, not appellate, jurisdiction.” Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Saudi Basic Industries Corp., 544 U.S. 280, 283 (2005). Having been unsuccessful with his petition for a writ of mandamus in state court, petitioner cannot ask this court to overturn that denial. *Id.* at 284 (citing District of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman, 460 U.S. 462 (1983), Rooker v. Fidelity Trust Co., 263 U.S. 413 (1923)).

27 | //

28 || //

1 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the clerk of the court shall file the notice of appeal.

2 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this action is **DISMISSED** for lack of jurisdiction. The
3 clerk of the court shall enter judgment accordingly.

4 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a certificate of appealability, to the extent one is
5 necessary, is **DENIED**.

6
7 DATED this 10th day of December, 2010.
8

9
10 
11 LARRY R. HICKS
12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28